

(Stipulating Parties Listed on Signature Page)

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

In re: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Case No. 07-5944 SC  
MDL No. 1917

This Document Relates to:  
  
ALL INDIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS

**STIPULATION AND ~~[PROPOSED]~~  
ORDER REGARDING PAGE LIMITS  
AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE FOR THE  
PHILIPS TAIWAN LIMITED AND  
PHILIPS DO BRASIL LTDA. MOTION  
TO DISMISS FOR INSUFFICIENT  
SERVICE OF PROCESS AND LACK OF  
PERSONAL JURISDICTION**

MDL 1917  
**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING PAGE LIMITS AND BRIEFING  
SCHEDULE FOR THE PHILIPS DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS FOR INSUFFICIENT  
SERVICE OF PROCESS AND LACK OF PERSONAL JURISDICTION**

1 WHEREAS, Defendants Philips Taiwan Limited and Philips do Brasil Ltda<sup>1</sup> (collectively the  
 2 “Philips Defendants”) have specially appeared and filed a motion to dismiss the claims of the  
 3 Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs (“IPPs”) for insufficient service of process and lack of personal  
 4 jurisdiction on March 26, 2014 (Dkt. No. 2470);<sup>2</sup>

5 WHEREAS, IPPs served an opposition to this motion on April 14, 2014 (Dkt. No. 2536);

6 WHEREAS, the IPPs’ opposition responds to two motions to dismiss: (1) the above-  
 7 referenced motion filed on March 16, 2014; and (2) the Philips Defendants’ original motion to  
 8 dismiss for insufficient service and lack of personal jurisdiction filed on May 18, 2009 (Dkt. No.  
 9 476), which the Philips Defendants incorporate into the March 2014 motion by reference;<sup>3</sup>

10 WHEREAS, the Philips Defendants’ May 2009 motion argues that this Court lacks personal  
 11 jurisdiction over them and provides declarations from their employees in support of their motion;

12 WHEREAS, the Philips Defendants’ March 2014 motion argues, among other things, that the  
 13 IPPs have failed to prosecute the case against them;

14 WHEREAS, the IPPs’ required a one and a half page increase in the page length of their  
 15 opposition to adequately address the issues raised in the May 2009 and March 2014 motions and  
 16 supporting declarations;

17 WHEREAS, IPPs’ memorandum of points and authorities in opposition to the Philips  
 18 Defendants’ motions to dismiss is just over 26 pages;

19 WHEREAS, the Philips Defendants’ motion is not scheduled for oral argument until May 30,  
 20 2014;

---

21  
 22  
 23 <sup>1</sup> The IPPs’ amended complaints name Philips Electronics Industries (Taiwan), Ltd. and Philips da Amazonia Industria  
 24 Ltda. as defendants. Philips Electronics Industries (Taiwan), Ltd. has been merged into Philips Taiwan Limited and  
 Philips da Amazonia Industria Electronica Ltda. has been merged into Philips do Brasil Ltda.

25 <sup>2</sup> Undersigned counsel from Baker Botts L.L.P. are only appearing to assert the Philips Defendants’ motion to dismiss  
 26 for insufficient service of process and lack of personal jurisdiction. This appearance is not meant to, and does not,  
 constitute a general appearance or a waiver of any objections the Philips Defendants have to the sufficiency of the IPPs’  
 service of process and allegations related to personal jurisdiction

27 <sup>3</sup> See Dkt No. 2470 at p.1, fn. 3.

WHEREAS, counsel for the Philips Defendants and counsel for the IPPs have met and conferred and have agreed upon page limits relating to the IPPs' opposition brief and a mutually acceptable briefing schedule relating to the Philips Defendants' reply brief in support of their motion to dismiss;

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the Philips Defendants and the IPPs that:

1. The IPPs' 27 page opposition brief is deemed permissible .
2. The Philips Defendants shall file their reply brief in support of their motion to dismiss on or before May 1, 2014. This revised briefing schedule will have no impact on the currently scheduled hearing date for the Philips Defendants' motion to dismiss.

\* \* \*

The undersigned parties jointly and respectfully request that the Court enter this stipulation as an order.

Dated: April 22, 2014

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

By: /s/ Erik T. Koons  
 Jon V. Swenson (SBN 233054)  
 1001 Page Mill Road  
 Building One, Suite 200  
 Palo Alto, CA 94304  
 Telephone: (650) 739-7500  
 Facsimile: (650) 739-7699  
 Email: jon.swenson@bakerbotts.com

John M. Taladay (*pro hac vice*)  
 Joseph Ostoyich (*pro hac vice*)  
 Erik T. Koons (*pro hac vice*)  
 Charles M. Malaise (*pro hac vice*)  
**BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.**  
 1299 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
 Washington, DC 20004-2400  
 Telephone: (202) 639-7700  
 Facsimile: (202) 639-7890  
 Email: john.taladay@bakerbotts.com  
 Email: joseph.ostoyich@bakerbotts.com  
 Email: erik.koons@bakerbotts.com  
 Email: charles.malaise@bakerbotts.com

*Attorneys Specially Appearing for  
Defendants Philips Taiwan Limited and  
Philips do Brasil Ltda.*

TRUMP, ALIOTO, TRUMP & PRESCOTT,  
LLP

By: /s/ Mario N. Alioto

MARIO N. ALIOTO (SBN 56433)  
Email: malioto@tatp.com  
LAUREN C. CAPURRO (SBN 241151)  
Email: lauren russell@tatp.com  
**TRUMP, ALIOTO, TRUMP &  
PRESCOTT, LLP**  
2280 Union Street  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
Telephone: (415) 563-7200  
Facsimile: (415) 346-0679

*Interim Lead Counsel for the Indirect  
Purchaser Plaintiffs*

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 04/28/2014

